

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| THE APPLICATION OF SOUTH KENTUCKY |) | |
| RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE |) | |
| CORPORATION, INC. FOR AN ADJUSTMENT |) | CASE NO. 94-400 |
| TO ITS RETAIL ELECTRIC POWER TARIFFS |) | |

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that South Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation, Inc. ("South Kentucky") shall file an original and 10 copies of the following information with this Commission, with a copy to all parties of record. Each copy of the information should be placed in a separate volume with each item numbered to correspond to the request included herein. When a number of sheets are required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 1(a), Sheet 2 of 6. Include with each response the name of the person who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to ensure that it is legible. The information is due no later than February 14, 1995.

1. Refer to Exhibit D of the application. Provide workpapers which show the derivation of the following amounts:
 - a. \$77,149 decrease in Section B rates.
 - b. \$120,115 decrease in Section C rates.
 - c. \$2,970,400 decrease in Section E rates.

d. \$449,028 increase in load center rates for Section E consumers.

e. Does any of the load center increase apply to Section B or Section C consumers? If yes, why was the load center increase not prorated among Sections B, C, and E?

2. Refer to Exhibit E of the application. For each size light, provide workpapers which show the derivation of the decrease in the fixed rate. These workpapers should identify the monthly energy (kwh) consumption for each size light and show how the decrease in Section E energy rates (per Exhibit D of the application) translates to a decrease in the fixed lighting rate.


3. In the event South Kentucky's wholesale power cost is ultimately reduced by an amount greater than the decrease that went into effect January 1, 1995, should the additional reduction be reflected in retail rates by using the same allocation methodology proposed by South Kentucky? If no, explain fully.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 30th day of January, 1995.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


For the Commission

ATTEST:


Executive Director